- -

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR WRIT TO TRANSFER DEFENDANT TO EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON ~ 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

1 lallitili,

ANGEL VERA CAMPOS,

v.

Defendant.

NO: 11-CR-109-RMP

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR REDUCTION OF SENTENCE

**BEFORE THE COURT** is a Motion for Reduction of Sentence filed by the *pro se* Defendant. ECF No. 139. The motion was heard without oral argument. Assistant United States Attorney Tim Ohms filed a response on behalf of the United States. ECF No. 140. The Court has considered the briefing and the file, and is fully informed.

Defendant originally pled guilty to Counts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Superseding Indictment in this case, and was sentenced to 135 months imprisonment on Counts 2, 3, 5 and 6, with a 60 month consecutive sentence

imposed on Count 4. ECF Nos. 59, 74. Following Defendant's appeal to the Ninth Circuit, the Court of Appeals issued a slip opinion vacating the Defendant's judgment of conviction on only Court 4 of the Superseding Indictment and remanding for further proceedings. ECF No. 98. Defendant then entered into a Settlement Agreement with the United States. ECF No. 134. The stated purpose of the Settlement Agreement was "to reach an agreed resolution as to all matters pending before the Court in the present case." ECF No. 134 at 4. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the parties agreed 1) that the United States would dismiss Count 4 of the Superseding Indictment; and 2) that the parties would recommend a sentence of 135 months on Counts 2, 3, 5, and 6. ECF No. 134 at 4-6. The Court sentenced Defendant to 135 months on Counts 2, 3, 5 and 6. ECF No. 135.

Defendant now brings a motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2), which allows for modification of an imposed term of imprisonment "in the case of a defendant who has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has been subsequently lowered by the Sentencing Commission . . . ." The statute further provides that the Court must consider the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), and that any reduction in sentence must be "consistent with the applicable policy statements issued by the

Sentencing Commission." 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). Section 3582(c)(2) provides an exception to the general rule that a court "may not modify a term of imprisonment once it has been imposed." Section 3582(c).

Defendant contends that the Sentencing Commission has altered Section 2D1.1 of the United States Sentencing Guidelines such that his base offense level would be reduced by two levels, from 34 to 32. With acceptance of responsibility applied, Defendant's adjusted offense level would be reduced from 31 to 29. Defendant contends that this change would reduce the low end of his guideline range by 27 months.

However, USSG § 2D1.1(c)(3) still provides for a base offense level of 34 in cases involving at least 150 grams but less than 500 grams of Methamphetamine (actual). Thus Defendant's base offense level remains 34 under current USSG § 2D1.1. Defendant has not shown that he was "sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has been subsequently lowered by the Sentencing Commission" as necessary to trigger 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). Because the Defendant has not shown that an exception applies, the Court "may not modify a term of imprisonment once it has been imposed." 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The relevant policy statement for reductions of terms of imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) is found in USSG § 1B1.10.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR WRIT TO TRANSFER DEFENDANT TO EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  $\sim 4$